Dkt. No: NELSR-P01 Appln. No.: 10/661,302 Reply to Office action of 10/09/2009

10

15

20

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The claims outstanding in this application are Claims 12 and 14-19. The Examiner has rejected all Claims stating that although Guide teaches advertisement by size, it does not explicitly disclose that prices fore larger advertisements are less than prices for smaller advertisement. The Examiner continues by stating it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the application was made, to know that publishers could decide to charge less for a large advertisement and more for a small advertisement since there are only three ways of determining rates for different sizes: [1] higher rate for larger ad; [2] lower rate for larger ad; and [3] same rate for all sizes. Continuing the Examiner state no unexpected results are obtained in choosing one rate plan over another and such is

Applicant stands by all of applicant's previous responses and the Appeal Brief, all of which are incorporated herein by reference.

Applicant disagrees with the Examiner that a person of ordinary skill in the art; i.e., a <u>business person</u> would charge less for a larger advertisement and such clearly is <u>unheard of</u>.

The unexpectedness of the present system <u>is the lesser charge for a larger ad</u> with tremendous increase in volume. Such a lesser charge is unanticipated and is the opposite of what any business

Dkt. No: NELSR-P01 Appln. No.: 10/661,302 Reply to Office action of 10/09/2009

5

10

person would ordinarily do and currently does.

Applicant maintains that the features of the presently claimed system of greater observable size yields less in <a href="total">total</a>
<a href="cost">cost</a> for an advertisement regardless of duration AND if a discount is offered by the merchant/advertiser to the consumer, the <a href="total">total</a>
<a href="cost">cost</a> will be lowered even more. Moreover, <a href="total">the greater the</a>
<a href="discount">discount</a> being offered by the merchant/advertiser will lower the total cost for the advertisement.

In view of the clear distinctions between the cited prior art and the present claims, applicant respectfully requests early reconsideration, allowance, and issue of this application or in the alternative, submission of applicant's appeal for consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

/Frank G. Morkunas/

Frank G. Morkunas

Reg. No. 38,974, C/N 23,653

7750 Dagget St., Ste 203 San Diego, CA 92111 Phone: 858-565-0799 Fax: 858-268-9968